

**Application No.:** 10/579,695  
**Filing Date:** May 21, 2007

### **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to the undersigned during the telephonic interview of May 23, 2011. The participants in that interview were the Examiner and the undersigned. In the interview, Applicant requested clarification regarding the comment on page 3 of the Office Action that "Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form...." The Examiner confirmed that this statement should have read instead that "Claim 10 is objected to, but would be allowable if amended to delete the extraneous semicolon after the term 'mechanism.'"

The objection to Claim 10 was also discussed. Applicant agreed to submit a written response to the outstanding Office Action explaining that the objected-to character was not a semicolon, but a deleted (and thus, struck-through) comma, and the Examiner agreed that the objection to Claim 10 should be withdrawn.